

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,420	08/21/2003	Ming C. Kuo	010121-9886-00	8062
23409	7590 01/12/2006		EXAM	INER
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP			KOPEC, MARK T	
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1751	1751

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/645,420	KUO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark Kopec	1751				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 Oc	ctober 2005.					
·- ·						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>5 and 20-27</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-19 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers		*				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	ate atent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	The second of the second				

Applicant's election of Group I/Species 1 in the reply filed on 10/21/05 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 5 and 20-27 are withdrawn from consideration.

The preliminary amendment filed 08/21/03 is entered.

Claims 1, 6, 9 and 16 are objected to because of the following informalities: in order to conform to current U.S. practice, applicant should amend the instant claim terminology "comprises at least one of" to proper Markush language --selected from the group consisting of--. Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere* Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for

establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-4 and 6-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wan et al (5,773,394) or JP 02002250353

A (Denpo et al), either in view of Hedges (5,498,372).

Wan et al discloses conducting polymer thickened grease compositions. The grease compositions are used in motor/bearing applications, and containing electrically conductive filler

materials such as carbon black (Abstract; Col 1, lines 11-48; Col 5, lines 32-40; Table 1).

JP '353 discloses electric conductive grease used in bearing applications. The grease contains 0.2-10 mass% carbon black (Abstract).

While each of Wan et al (5,773,394) or JP 02002250353 A inherently disclose or render obvious the claimed motor/bearing limitations, the references differ from the instant claims in failing to recite the use of grease containing conductive particles which are at least partially coated with conductive polymer.

Hedges discloses Electrically conductive polymeric compositions suitable for fabricating devices for safely transporting volatile chemicals and fuels are disclosed. The electrically conductive polymeric compositions include at least one matrix polymer and an electrically conductive filler material incorporated in the matrix polymer in an amount sufficient to provide the conductive polymeric composition with an electrical conductivity of at least 10.sup.-10 S/cm. The electrically conductive filler material is intrinsically conductive polymer coated carbon black particles. The coating of intrinsically electrically conductive polymer provides a protective shield

against loss of particle conductivity, contributes to the overall conductivity of the filler material and enhances the mechanical properties of the filled matrix polymer (Abstract). Hedges specifically teaches that the ICP-coated carbon particles retain their conductivity and their long term ability to decrease static charge generation in the presence of chemicals and other environments (Col 2, lines 41-52; Col 3, lines 48-55; Col 4, lines 3-14; Col 10, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the ICP-coated carbon blacks disclosed in Hedges in place of the uncoated carbon blacks disclosed in either Wan et al (5,773,394) or JP 02002250353 A as Hedges teaches several advantages using the coated materials. The advantageous properties would motivate one or ordinary skill to utilize the ICP-coated carbon in a conductive grease utility.

In view of the foregoing, the above claims have failed to patentably distinguish over the applied art.

The remaining references listed on forms 892 and 1449 have been reviewed by the examiner and are considered to be cumulative to or less material than the prior art references relied upon in the rejection above.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,420

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Kopec whose telephone number is (571) 272-1319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark Kopec
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

Page 6

MK January 7, 2006